REMARKS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-10 are currently pending.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the suggested Amendments to claims 1 and 5. With respect to claim 5, the Applicant believes that the Examiner meant to suggest amendments to claim 6. Claims 1 and 6 are amended herein to recite "a first set of frames" and "a second set of frames" in order to more fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

With respect to the statement regarding claims 2 and 7 on page 2 of the Office Action that "[i]t is unclear how the frames discarded could be 'predictive-coded pictures' since they are never encoded by the encoder", the Applicant respectfully disagrees. The application discloses, for example, that:

> In the frame skipping process of FIG. 6, the input video signal to the MPEG2 encoder 10 is encoded in the **IPPP** format. Moreover, the input video signal is encoded based on the data structure of FIG. 3, and the frame skipping process is performed per video pack.

Page 14, lines 26-30, of the application, emphasis added. Per the above, the input video signal to the MPEG2 encoder is already encoded in the IPPP format. Thus, the application discloses that the second set of frames may be predictive-coded pictures, as recited in claims 2 and 7.

Claims 3 and 6 are amended herein to recite "the first set of frames".

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY SACKSTEIN ET AL. (WO98/45959)

Amended claim 1 recites an encoding unit performing predictive coding of an input video sequence having a plurality of frames and a first unit leaving a first set of frames at predetermined intervals in the input video sequence to cause the encoding unit to perform predictive coding of the first set of frames. Amended claim 6 recites somewhat similar features. The Applicant respectfully submits that Sackstein fails to disclose these features.

The Office Action states that Sackstein discloses a first unit leaving a first set of frames, asserting that page 3, lines 8-10 of Sackstein discloses "the first set is the set selected by sub

4

sampling." See page 3, of the Office Action. Sackstein discusses sub-sampling a video signal before compression according to a predetermined duty cycle. See page 3, lines 8-12, of Sackstein. On page 2, lines 5-7, Sackstein defines sub-sampling as "sampling a given signal, audio or video, at a considerably low rate, lower than an optimal one, which is usually predetermined in a given standard." However, claim 1 recites that the first leaving unit leaves a first set of frames at predetermined intervals in the **input video sequence**. This causes the coding unit to perform predictive coding of the first set of frames.

Amended claim 1 further recites a second unit discarding a second set of frames, which lie between two frames of the first set of frames in the input video sequence, to cause the encoding unit to skip each frame in the second set of frames and perform predictive coding of a corresponding frame of the first set of frames immediately preceding a frame from the second set of frames. Claim 6 recites somewhat similar features. Sackstein also fails to disclose these features.

The Office Action states on page 4 "[n]ote in the removed frames are replaced buy P-frames which denote that all information is contained in the previous frame (predictive coding of a corresponding frame of the first frames immediately preceding the second frame)." As indicated in the Office Action, Sackstein discusses that "[a] P frame is inserted in the stream in place of each discarded frame." See page 3, lines 17-18, of Sackstein. However, claim 1 recites discarding a second set of frames to cause the encoding unit to skip each frame in the second set of frames and perform predictive coding of a **corresponding frame of the first set of frames immediately preceding** a frame from the second set of frames. Thus, Sackstein fails to anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV.   CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

5

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7-2-2007

By: _Michael A. Leonard II_
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501